DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 820 HE 018 864

AUTHOR Harper, Aylene S.
TITLE Faculty and Student Development.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American College Personnel Association (Boston, MA, March 24-27, 1985).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Students; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Educational History; Extracurricular Activities; Higher Education; Individual Development; Intellectual Development; Models; Social Change; *Student Development; Student Needs; Student Personnel Services; *Teacher Role; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Theories

ABSTRACT

The role of faculty in student development is considered. The history of the student development movement from the Colonial period to the twentieth century and major student development theories are also reviewed. Important objectives of contemporary student development are identified: to promote students' intellectual and individual development; to treat students as individuals; to understand the relevance of student group life; and to implement clinical and research findings concerning student development. The following theories are described: Perry's intellectual and ethical model, Knefelkamp and Slepitza's adaptation of Perry's model to career decision-making, Chickering's vector theory of student development, Sanford's model of challenge and support, and Astin's theory of student involvement. Assumptions of student personnel work and the human development model are identified. Three major factors affect student development: changing psychological concepts and social change; new procedures for solving old problems; and changes in educational structures based on new educational goals or new students populations. Attention is directed to the role of faculty members in promoting student development, including designing and evaluating curricula and extracurricular programs and academic advising to meet changing student needs. A four-page list of references is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263820

Faculty and Student Development

Aylene S. Harper

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Aylene S. Harper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 01 8 804

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American College Student Personnel Association.

Abstract

It is important to recognize the role of faculty in student development. The history of student development, major theorists and theories, and the relationship of faculty to student development are examined. Student development should be a primary purpose of faculty. The personnel point of view is described. A history of the student development movement from the Colonial period to the twentieth century is reviewed. Some of the major theorists in the field of student development are presented. The intellectual and ethical model of Perry is summarized. Knefelkamp and Slepitza's adaptation of Perry's model to career decision-making is described. Chickering's vector theory of student development is explained. Nevitt Sanford's model of challenge and support is presented. In addition, Astin's theory of student involvement is explored. Using student development theories, faculty can design curriculum programs to meet changing student needs. The relationship of faculty to student development and major assumptions of the human development model are described. Modifications of the human development model for faculty are identified based on changing concepts, new procedures, and changing students. Student development can be increased if faculty periodically review and evaluate curriculum, procedures, and programs from a student development perspective. Faculty play a major role in student development.

Student development is a major emphasis at many institutions of higher education in the 20th century. Faculty should enhance the concept of student development in curricular as well as extra-curricular programs. A history of the field of student personnel and student development will be reviewed. Some of the major theorists and theories of student development will be described. Finally, the significance of faculty adopting the human development model of student development at colleges will be presented.

There is a basic premise that "a college (and a university to a lesser extent) exist for one primary purpose, that of providing opportunity for student learning through instruction in many forms and settings. . .which contributes to student learning and development" (Mueller, 1961, p. 4). The integration of learning in all areas of college student life is important. The philosophy of the college and the faculty should involve learning in the classroom as well as outside the classroom. A total student development perspective is based on the importance of the roles of higher education in transmitting knowledge and knowledge innovation (Mueller, 1961, pp. v-vi).

The Middle Ages to the beginning of the 19th century is the first major period in the student development movement. American and European higher education gave a great deal of attention to the total development of the student as well as the student's intellectual development (Mueller, 1961, p. 2). Student development

may have begun during the Middle Ages when monks did some personal counseling. By the Colonial period the focus on student development was comprehensive. Students often lived away from home in campus residences. Students were frequently trained for teaching positions or clergy positions, therefore, spiritual, moral, personal, ethical, and social development were considered important aspects of total education. Faculty performed the role of "en loco parentis," serving in place of the parents while students were on campus, thereby increasing the emphasis of education on total student development.

During the 19th century, the dominance of the German research-centered university brought about a focus on the intellectual aspects of education and the de-emphasis on a personal interest in students. Due to the influence of the German models as well as the influence of German-trained Ph.D. recipients, faculty concentrated on intellectual development rather than other aspects of student development (Mueller, 1961, p. 2).

By the 20th century there was a return to the total development of the student based on many factors including mass education, testing and guidance, war veterans on college campuses, and other forces (Mueller, 1961, p. 55). Total student development is an important component in the effectiveness with which faculty can perform its role. Due to the contemporary emphasis on specialization, faculty have sometimes been

criticized for neglecting other personality traits of students while concentrating on their intellectual development. Both personal development and intellectual development should be the concern of faculty.

A concept coined "the student personnel point of view" evolved to address the importance of an emphasis on total student development--personal, social, spiritual, ethical, moral, and vocational as well as intellectual development. The focus is total student development rather than exclusively intellectual development. This is based on six assumptions.

1. Development encompasses the student as a whole
2. Education is expanded to include total student development
3. The student is an active participant rather than a passive recipient in higher education
4. A major goal of higher education is helping the student move toward a full and balanced maturity
5. There should be integrated efforts toward the development of every aspect of the student's potential and personality
6. The student has a need to develop a sound philosophy of life should not be neglected in the pursuit of intellectual development or professional training (Williamson, 1949b, pp. 1-2).

During the early 20th century, the movement from the German-centered intellectual focus changed to the present emphasis on total student development. In reaction to the intellectualism of the German-influenced perspective of the 19th century, student development became a comprehensive force in higher education

(Williamson, 1949b, pp. 2-3). As many students began enrolling in higher education, faculty began nurturing personal and individual relationships with students.

The student personnel point of view was first described by the American Council on Education as a report in 1926. It embraces student development as part of the comprehensive institutional program at colleges and universities by identifying the basic component of student development and the philosophical base (Williamson, 1949b, pp. iii-iv).

The student development philosophy received much impetus because of the increasing scope of higher education. Mueller (1961, 57-60) also pointed out the influence of large, more heterogeneous campus groups, the greater range of educational objectives, and new methods for dealing with students such as computerization and testing. Mueller (1961, p. 12) stated, "Besides the obvious intellectual aspect of his personality, man has physical characteristics, vocational interests and aptitudes, aesthetic appreciation, moral and religious values, emotional resources, and social relationships--all integral parts and ultimately and inextricably in his intellectual development."

Although there is no total agreement on the functions of higher education, student development plays a major role as a component of college and university life. Each college and faculty must adapt the emphasis on student development to its own goals and objectives. For example, student development at a two-year

college may differ from that at a research-oriented university.

Among faculty in higher education there is a need to continue to emphasize the importance of a comprehensive student development program. There are five important objectives of contemporary student development.

1. To treat univeristy and college students as individuals.

2. Awareness of the relevance of student group life including such areas as admissions and job placement.

3. Concern with students individually as well as in groups.

4. The individualized implementation of clinicial and research findings from appropriate academic disciplines. This objective is helped by the interdisciplinary nature of student development, which borrows from the fields of education, psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology, and related fields.

5. Helping students in the college environment to develop fully (Mueller, 1961, pp. 18 & 67).

A number of educators have established theories of student development. Each of the theories reflects a perspective that is useful in describing the evolution of student development and its relationship to faculty.

Perry (1970, pp. 9-10) devised a scheme of student development based on taped interviews of students at Harvard College from 1954 to 1963 (pp. 1-8). He identified nine major positions on a continuum.

1. Basic dualism. Students view matters as right or wrong, black or white, and the authority figure is always right.

2. Multiplicity prelegimate. There are extensions of thought and elaborations and accommodations.

3. Multiplicity subordinate. There is the question of reward for hard work.

4. The multiplicity correlate. The student believes it is better to have a dubious truth than a false certainty.

5. A breakdown of the old structure and identity.

6. Commitment foreseen, which is an affirmation of what is one's own.

7. Initial commitment.

8. An orientation in the implications of commitment.

9. Developing commitments.

Alternatives to growth include: temporizing, a pause for a year or more to gather forces; retreat, entrenching oneself in anger and hatred of others; and, finally, escape, entrenchment in the absolutist position of the early stages of development (positions 2 or 3) (Perry, 1970, p. 10). Perry's theory of the intellectual and cognitive development of students has been used to design educational experiences to enhance cognitive development from a theoretical perspective. The importance of Perry's model is that it identifies stages of development through which students pass that can be used by faculty in preparing material and concepts to increase student development irrespective of the institutional setting.

Knefelkamp and Slepitza adapted Perry's theory to individual thinking about careers and career decision-making (Knefelkamp & Slepitza, 1976, pp. 53-58). As students move through the career planning process based on Perry's nine stages of development, they gain a more integrated knowledge of the interpersonal relationship among personal identity, values, and the total career-life planning process leading to more satisfying career commitments (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983c, p. 1).

Dualism is the belief that there is only one right career. Stage one involves absolute reliance on ideas from external authority figures. Stage two is the possibility of right/wrong career decisions (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983c, p. 1).

Multiplicity is the elimination and reduction of making wrong decisions by relying on a counselor. Stage three is the greater possibility of making right/wrong career decisions. Stage four is a more complex weighing of components in stage three related to right/wrong decisions (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983c, p. 2).

In relativism students shift from an external to an internal locus of control. Stage five is the recognition of multiple possibilities and the need to create personal order. In stage six the students begin to realize that choices must be made (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983c, p. 2).

In commitment with relativism students assume increased responsibility for the career decision-making process. Stage

seven is the period in which the individual experiences the integration of self and career role. In stage eight, the individual experiences the consequences of the commitments. By stage nine there is an increased expansion of one's self-created role (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983c, p. 3). The more qualitative changes through the developmental sequence are: shift to internal locus of control, analysis, synthesis, semantic structure, self-processing, ability to assume responsibility, ability to take new roles, and the ability to take risks with self (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983c, p. 3).

A third major student development theorist is Chickering (Thomas & Chickering, 1984, pp. 392-399). His developmental theory supports developmental learning. He believes that development is a combination of integration and differentiation in which there are seven vectors of development (Thomas & Chickering, 1984, pp. 395-401).

1. Achieving competence: intellectually, physically and manually, interpersonally, and gaining a clear sense of competence.

2. Managing emotions through increasing awareness and integration.

3. Developing autonomy in emotional independence, instrumental independence, and interdependence (Chickering, 1976, chapters I-III).

4. Establishing identity through clarification of physical needs, characteristics, and personal appearance as well as clarification of sex-appropriate roles and behaviors and sexual identification.

5. The freeing of interpersonal relationships through increased tolerance and an improvement in the quality of intimate relationships.

6. Clarifying purposes through establishing priorities and plans in recreational and avocational interests, vocational aspirations and plans, and life style.

7. Developing integrity through humanizing values, personalizing values, and building congruence. (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983a, pp. 3-4)

Chickering (1967, chapters 8-13) identifies six major aspects of the college environment. These environments are the sources of influence or conditions for impact on the vectors of student development.

1. Consistency of objectives and clarity which can increase student development.

2. Institutional size, increasing size tending to decrease student development.

3. Curriculum, teaching, and research. As control by the institution increases through traditional teaching models, student development decreases. With flexibility in choice and teaching models for learning experiences, student development increases.

4. Residence hall arrangements which can either enhance or deter student development.

5. Faculty and administration. Increasing student-faculty interaction increases the likelihood of student development.

6. Student culture which can enhance or deter student development (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983a, pp. 3-4).

Another major student development theorist is Sanford, who believes that a dominant objective of education should be the

maximum development of the individual's potential within a change-oriented organization (Sanford, 1966, pp. 3-22). He believes there is an important balance between support and challenge which must occur in order for development to take place. Development occurs by giving the individual enough challenge to progress and enough support to reinforce the ability to progress (McEwen & Stonewater, 1983b, p. 1).

Sanford believes that faculty can lead the individual toward greater development by presenting the student with strong challenges, appraising accurately the student's ability to cope with these challenges, and offering support when the challenges become overwhelming (Sanford, 1966, pp. 46-47). He thinks that it is the function of colleges and faculty to help students mature and develop as individuals (Sanford, 1963, p. 289). Understanding the role of knowledge and thinking in the functioning and development of the personality is an important consideration (Sanford, 1963, p. 424). By placing emphasis in the curriculum on the development of the individual student, curricular offerings can serve to enhance student development. The use of challenge and response creates a method for dealing with student development. By designing a curriculum that has an appropriate degree of challenge and response, faculty can increase student development.

A fifth student development theorist is Astin (1984, p. 297), whose theory of student involvement is based on the behavioral

mechanisms or processes that enhance student development (Astin, 1984, p. 301). Almost all forms of student involvement enhance student development. Living on campus increases students' chances of persisting. Participating in honors programs increases student development. Academic involvement improves student development. Also, increasing student development comes about if students are engaged in student-faculty interaction, athletic involvement, and student government (Astin, 1984, pp. 303-304). The greater the amount of participation and involvement by students in the educational process, the greater is the degree of student development that occurs.

For Astin, passivity is a warning signal that may indicate a lack of student involvement. Faculty are encouraged to focus less on teaching techniques and content and more on student motivation, including the time devoted by the students to the learning process (Astin, 1984, p. 304).

The students' subjective impressions of the college environment depend on the environment as well as on the values, abilities, previous experiences, and attitudes of the student (Astin, 1968, p. 94). Getting the student involved in campus life and activities expands the potential for increasing individual development. The student's perception of the educational setting influences the degree of involvement. Increasing opportunities for student involvement by faculty can bring about increasing

opportunities for individual student development.

Developmental theory in contemporary student development can be helpful to faculty. Perry, Chickering, Knefelkamp and Slepitza, Sanford, and Astin each present student development theories that attempt to enhance the ability of faculty to maximize the individual development of college students.

Student development at colleges and universities is important for faculty. Faculty "should endeavor to provide the best possible offerings and learning environment for each and every student" (Miller, 1977, p. 166). Sometimes the educational environment does not allow for the heterogeneous age differences among students. The development of human identification and a self-concept is needed in the lives of students (Miller, 1977, p. 34). Student development should be encouraged by faculty because it plays a major role in students' education. Teaching brings about the pooling of knowledge that can be used by faculty to enhance student development (Diekhoff, 1966, p. 190).

The rise of the student development movement came about largely due to the application of psychological research to problem-solving, the work of Thorndike, Cattell, and others during and after World War I, the secularization of education, the increases in student populations, and the attacks upon the intellectualistic impersonalism of American Ph.D. recipients

trained in Gemany (Williamson, 1949a, p. 16). Some of the common beliefs of student personnel work include (a) the worth of the individual; (b) the equal dignity of thinking, feeling, and working; (c) the world has a place for everybody; and (d) the individual keeps information that is absorbed rather than imposed (Lloyd-Jones & Smith, 1954, p. 5).

Faculty in higher education deal with many problems that reflect the complexity of contemporary society. Some of the problems include (a) a loss of comprehensiveness with the increased emphasis on specialization, (b) partnerships with business and industry that do not let colleges retain decision-making control, (c) difficulty maintaining quality, (d) the loss of funding for community services, (e) increasing costs to students, (e) the loss of decision-making power as legislators and external agencies begin taking larger roles in the education (Vaughn and Associates, 1983, pp. 12-14).

Contemporary student development uses the human development model which is based on five major assumptions.

1. Those working with students will be aware of the unique problems and processes associated with various student populations, building programs addressing specific issues.

2. An institution-wide effort of fluid interaction between student services and all levels of instruction.

3. All areas of student services and instruction can become developmentally-oriented.

4. All areas of the college will focus on student development.

5. An integrated effort-system wide will deal with student development based on student needs that are carefully identified (Vaughn and Associates, 1983, pp. 154-155).

By using the human development model, faculty can enhance student development effectively. According to Donald Creamer, "Student development is not merely a form which because it sounds better than student personnel services gives significance to student services professionals. It is a concept which focuses on one of the major purposes of higher education" (Vaughn and Associates, 1983, p. 155).

Current trends indicate that student development will continue to play an important role in higher education for faculty because of several factors, including (a) the need for ongoing professional or occupational postsecondary education; (b) the rapid growth of high technology, computer, and information-related occupations; (c) the need to help decrease national illiteracy (Vaughn and Associates, 1983, p. 247). By enhancing student development, faculty can play an increasingly important role in meeting societal needs.

Student development can be modified as a result of three major factors.

1. An awareness of new needs arising from changing psychological concepts and social change.

2. The development of new tools and procedures for solving old problems in new ways.

3. Change in the educational structure based on changing educational goals or changes in the population served (Williamson, 1949a, p. 267).

Some problems need to be resolved at colleges in order that faculty may better implement student development. A need for evaluation of teaching procedures, attitudes, and standards exists. The curriculum needs to be given greater consideration based on ways in which it can enhance student development. There could be more emphasis on educating the faculty and staff on the importance of student development (Kelley & Wilbur, 1970, pp. 204-208).

A program for student development serves the students directly through an analysis of their specific needs and the development of unique programs. It also serves students indirectly by improving the general morale of the institution while focusing on student development (Wrenn, 1951, p. 3). Emphasis on the individual can enhance the total collegial environment for all segments of the college--faculty, staff, and students. Essential to the student development approach at colleges are a comprehensive philosophy of education, student development services, and effective administration of these services (Wrenn, 1951, pp. 3-4).

The philosophy of college faculty will affect its relationship to students. The student personnel services and

instructional services form the educational program of the college (Wrenn, 1951, p. 26). The student personnel point of view, or human development model of contemporary student development, ". . .adjusts for wide individual differences, stresses the development of the personality as a whole, and realistically starts the educational process at the point of present student maturity and need" (Wrenn, 1951, p. 27).

There are at least four means of implementing the student development philosophy.

1. Recognition by faculty of the diverse individual differences in student backgrounds, goals, interests, and abilities.
2. Faculty should identify their educational purposes based on students development objectives.
3. Flexibility in teaching methods and adapting content to meet student needs.
4. An integration of the various components of the curriculum (Williamson, 1949b, p. 3).

Faculty have a major responsibility to provide experiences for developing students (Williamson, 1949b, p. 4). Both curricular and extracurricular programs should integrate their efforts toward student development enrichment. By accepting the broad responsibility for student development, faculty need careful, periodic reviews of the curricular offerings, methods of instruction, and all other resources for facilitating student development (Williamson, 1949b, pp. 4-5).

Faculty must be encouraged to do as much as possible, with as many students as possible, especially because of the diversity and background of the college-student consistency. There should be increased interaction between the faculty and other personnel within the college community (Mueller, 1961, p. 222).

The effectiveness of student development in colleges is determined, to a large extent, by the institutional setting. If the institutional conditions are good and the chief administrative officer is supportive, student development will be enhanced. If the institutional climate is poor, student development will be impeded (Williamson, 1949b, p. 20).

Students should be involved in the ongoing functioning of the institution by having opportunities for input and decision-making which can be accomplished through student advisory groups and other activities (Williamson, 1961, p. 388). The curriculum of teaching and learning continues every year, but the students are constantly changing. Therefore, there should be frequent review of policies and programs as they relate to student development (Williamson, 1961, pp. 388-389).

Faculty should continue to be involved in academic advisement and extracurricular programming. Faculty can enhance student development by providing adult companionship, facilitating the cross-fertilization of ideas, and stimulating participation in both curricular and extracurricular programs (Mueller, 1961, pp. 214-219). All segments of the faculty need to work

together to promote student development.

Student development by faculty is important because of the student constituency served. Students at many colleges are heterogeneous and diverse due to liberal admission policies. Their needs cover a wide range as a result of the diversity. Some colleges have commuters with a limited amount of time to spend on campus, especially if they have part-time or full-time employment. Colleges usually have only 4 years to enhance student development. Therefore, the faculty must focus on student development intensely because of the brief time span.

Student development by faculty requires intensive effort as well as flexibility in scheduling and programming. Since many students are part-time, then programs and activities must be scheduled to meet the needs of students attending at night and on weekends. Much effort must be given to serving the specific needs of unique target populations such as commuters, the academically handicapped, the economically disadvantaged, minorities, and others. Programs must be designed to meet the special needs of these groups, both curricular and extracurricular involving faculty and staff as well as students.

Faculty should receive professional development programs and in-service training to educate them about the characteristics and objectives of the student development philosophy. Faculty should recognize the importance of supporting the guidance function at colleges. Helping faculty grasp the importance of implementing

student development programs utilizing input from students, faculty, and staff can be a valuable resource for implementing individual development among students.

Faculty can be educated to understand the importance of student development as a major objective of the educational philosophy requiring the integrated efforts and resources of all members of the college community. Faculty can be trained to serve as referral agents for those students who have special needs for financial assistance, vocational guidance, personal and social concerns, and related problems. If the faculty is to serve the diverse needs of a heterogeneous student body, then it must continue to find ways of improving and implementing student development.

References

Astin, A. W. (1968). The college environment. Washington, DC: The American Council on Education.

Astin, A. W. (1984, July). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 25.

Astin, A. W., Comstock, C., Epperson, D., Greeley, A., Katz, J., & Kaurrman, J. (1974, March). Faculty development in a time of retrenchment. Change Magazine.

Brown, J. (1974). Personal development and professional practice in college and university. Ann Arbor: University of Microfilms International.

Carkhuff, R. R. (1972). The art of helping. Amherst, MA: Carkuff Associates., Inc.

Chickering, A. W. (1974). Commuting versus resident students. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W. (1976). Education and identity. San Francisco: CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1977). The two-year college instructor today. New York: Praeger Special Studies.

Diekhoff, J. S. (1956). The domain of the faculty. New York: Harper and Bros.

Dressel, P. L., & Mayhew, L. B. (1974). Higher education as a field of study. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fields, R. R. (1962). The community college movement. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gibson, W. (Ed.). (1979). New students in two-year colleges, twelve essays. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Havighurst, R. B. (1971). Developmental tasks and education. New York: David McKay.

Kelley, W., & Wilbur, L. (1970). Teaching in the community junior college. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lloyd-Jones, E., & Smith, M. (Eds.). (1954). Student personnel work as deeper teaching. New York: Harper & Bros.

McEwen, M., & Stonewater, B. 1983a, March). Chickering's vectors of development for young adults. Handout presented at the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (NAWDAC). Houston, TX. (Workshop entitled "Student development theory: Making sense of it all, pp. 1-4)

McEwen, M., & Stonewater, B. (1983b, March). Sanford's concept of challenge and support. Handout presented at the workshop entitled Student development theory: Making sense of it all A NAWDAC workshop on theory and application at the NAWDAC Convention in Houston, Texas, p. 1.

McEwan, M., & Stonewater, B. (1983c, March). Knefelkamp-Slepitza Developmental Model of Career Development. Handout presented at the NAWDAC Convention, Houston, TX, pp. 1-3.

Miller, B. (1977). Higher education and the community college. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Mueller, K. H. (1961). Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

O'Bannion, T. (1972). Teachers for tomorrow: Staff development in the community-junior college. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.

Oglivie, W. K., & Raines, M. R. (1971). Perspectives on the community-junior college. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Porter, N., Taylor, N., & Oliver, H. (Eds.). (1972). How to assess the moral reasoning of students. Ontario, Canada: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Sanford, N. (1962). The American college. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). (1964). College and character. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Sanford, N. (1966). Self and society: Society change and individual development. New York: Atherton Press.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). (1970). Issues in personality theory. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stonewater, B., & Stonewater, J. (1981, Fall). Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development--A summary. Workshop document presented at the NAWDAC convention, Houston, TX. (Workshop entitled: Student development theory: Making sense of it all, pp. 1-7)

Super, D. E. (1942). The dynamics of vocational adjustment. New York: Harper and Bros.

Thelin, J. R. (1982). Higher education and its useful past. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

Thomas, R., & Chickering, A. W. (1984, September). Education and identity revisited. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 392-399.

Vaughn, G. B. and Associates. (1983). Issues for community college leaders in a new era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Williamson, E. G. (Ed.). (1949a). Trends in student personnel work. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.

Williamson, E. G. (1961). Student personnel services in colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Williamson, E. G. et al. (Eds.). (1949b). The student personnel point of view. Washington, DC: American Council on Education Studies.

Wrenn, C. G. (1951). Student personnel work in college. New York: The Ronald Press.

Wrenn, C. G., & Bell, R. (1942). Student personnel problems. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.

Wrenn, S. C. (1975, March). The college student and higher education policy: What stake and what purpose? The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.